



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

08/530537

EXAMINER	
Preis, Nadine	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1106	25

DATE MAILED:

### EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeffrey Abel (3) Nadine Preis  
(2) Walter Griffin (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of interview 11-19-96

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: 1-6

Identification of prior art discussed: JP 401135540 and Inoue et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicants proposed an amendment where the claim distinguish  
the heat resistant oxide is not a zeolite. - No formal agreement;  
Examiner Preis will consider new limitation in the next  
office action

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Nadine Preis  
Examiner's Signature

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**08/530,537**

Applicant(s)  
**Abe**

Examiner  
**Nadine Preisch**

Group Art Unit  
**1106**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nadine Preisch (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Jeffery Abel (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Sep 13, 1996

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: <sup>1-6</sup> ~~1-6~~, 11, and 12

Identification of prior art discussed:  
JP1139144 and Inoue et al. (5,292,696)I

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  
Attorney for Applicant, Jeffery Abel, agreed that no formal interview was necessary as previously was requested by applicant.

---No formal agreement was reached.

---Jeffery Abel pointed out JP1139144 for examiners further consideration and remarked that the previous rejection using the prior art of Inoue et al. was incorrect because applicants' catalyst is a two component system, not a one component system.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.